DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 809 LI 004 257

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Harvey, John F. |
| TITLE | Toward a Definition of International and Comparative Library Science. |
| PUB DATE | 72 |
| NOTE | 42p.; (40 References) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Foreign Countries; *International Programs; *Librarians; *Library Education; Library Research; *Library Science |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Iran; Librarianship |

ABSTRACT

The newness of a field which librarians are trying to identify and relate to their own concerns and activities is reflected in this paper. It explains the field's research methods and gives examples, as well as discussing its identification and proposing a series of new definitions. In so doing, it is much indebted to the Bereday, Simsova, and Sharify contributions mentioned therein. This is intended to be a pivotal introductory paper. In concluding, the paper proposes that library schools become truly international and teach the best elements from library science world-wide. (LI 004244 through 004256 and LI 004258 through 004267 are related.) (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

[ERIC User Note: Best Copy Available.]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 073809

# TOWARD A DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LIBRARY SCIENCE

"Those who can, discover, and those who cannot, take up methodology."--Researcher's Lament.

There seems to be no extensive definitional literature of international and comparative library science. Of course, this paper is not the first one of its kind, however, Bereday,[1] Simsova,[2] Foskett,[3] Shores,[4] Jackson,[5] and Dane,[6] among others, having preceeded it, and deserving careful study. Bereday's work is the Koran of the field for social scientists, to some extent and in much abbreviated form described and adapted for librarians by Simsova.[7] In preparing this discussion and explication, I am grateful to several friends around the world whose letters of helpful advice should be acknowledged here.[8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] The present paper will attempt to supplement all of their statements usefully.

As a part of the project to explain the theory of the topic, to myself as well as to the reader, three other papers were prepared for ellucidation, The International Man, Dean vs. Chairman, and Iranian vs. American Library Serial Selection Policies. Each one of these papers should provide an example of international or comparative library science for the interested reader.

If the reader is ready, then, the question of the moment may be proposed. What is, or what are, international and comparative library science? Before plunging into an extended definition of these two phrases, the paper will spend some time describing their setting and explaining related terms. After their definitions have been stated, explored, compared and contrasted, their particular research methodology

LI 004 257

described, and the difficulties of working in them discussed, certain of their global implications will be considered.

The Comparative Studies.--The development of comparative studies started in the 16th century with the term, comparative anatomy, analysis of the likenesses and differences between human and animal form. Since then, comparative fields have developed strongly in several other subject areas, such as psychology, medicine, biology, bio-chemistry, government, literature, linguistics, religion, law and education.

Each one of the comparative fields has its own pattern of individuality and similiarity to other fields. Comparative psychology is the study of animal versus human behavior. Comparative medicine compares animal and human medical problems and treatments. Comparative biology compares animal and human biology, and comparative bio-chemistry compares the chemical properties of all life forms. Comparative government and politics studies the similarities and differences in the political systems of different countries. However, much loose phraseology can be seen in this and other comparative fields, so a book which merely collects national constitutions may be called comparative politics, also. Comparative literature analyses the themes, plots, and characters found in literatures of various countries. Comparative linguistics studies the languages of various groups of people and nations. Comparative religion compares and contrasts the elements of different religions, their forms of worship, doctrine, architecture, and holy writings.

In contrast to their comparative phases, the international phases of psychology, medicine, biology, bio-chemistry, government, literature, linguistics, and religion tend to be less often spoken of, but, in all cases, to involve cross national considerations and activities.

Among the comparative fields, comparative and international law and education seem to be leaders in development. Though there is some variation in interpretation of their scope and emphasizes, comparative law

deals with the legal likenesses and differences between countries, particularly regarding the laws of specific problem areas. For instance, it is appropriate therein to study the divorce law in two socialist countries. In contrast, International law deals with the legal problems between two or more nations, the laws of international organizations and of outer space, without involving comparison. It covers the law of the oceans and international trade, for example. A third field, foreign law, on the other hand, simply describes the law existing in any other country than that of the author or the publisher. These three aspects of comparative and international law should make useful contributions to the development of definitions for comparative and international library science.

The field closest to comparative library science seems to be comparative education which is more than a century old and is relatively well developed.[14] The definitional situation in education is similar to that in law, though here, too, strict definitions are not always adhered to. Comparative education studies the comparisons in educational goals and practices between countries, often with a view toward seeking solutions to problems. In contrast, International education attempts to cover all multi-national educational activities, especially those of national and international organizations.

In the above description of the comparative and international fields, we may note that the term, comparative, carries geographic or cross national implications in the humanities and social sciences, but not in the sciences. In the social sciences generally, the term's use suggests focus on the investigation of social phenomena distributed in different societies or types of societies, multi-national. On the other hand, In the biological sciences generally, as in the field of anatomy, comparative usually has an animal vs. human denotation. In contrast, Also, it should be noted that, in a majority of cases, the entire comparative and international also foreign

field in all of its comparative, international and merely foreign aspects, tends in common practice, to be most often referred to and subsumed under the specialized word, comparative, rather than the seemingly more comprehensive word, international. Perhaps, this is due to the greater vagueness of the word, international, or to the more scholarly sound of the word, comparative. Cultural borrowing is a feature common to most of the comparative fields, many of the approaches and problems encountered in one can be seen in others, also.

Comparative Library Science Definitions.--Although having antecedants going back at least two or three generations, the field of comparative library science has developed primarily since 1964. Simsova claimed that Chase Dane used the term first, in 1954.[6] In the next ten years, the term appeared nowhere, but since that time its use has grown considerably. D. J. Foskett[3] and Carl White[15] were early term users as was Nasser Sharify.[16]

Before examining various definitions for comparative library science, perhaps we should define the generic term, library science. Library science is the study of modern librarianship. Library science is the study and practice of library management. Library science is the description, analysis and practice of the purposes, policies, and procedures of all types of information-handling organizations. Library science is the study and practice of user analysis, printed and audio-visual material selection, acquisition, organization, storage and service, in schools, colleges, corporations, government agencies, and public libraries, in fact, in institutions of all kinds. Library science is the art and science of bringing people and books together fruitfully. The broad and comprehensive field of library science should be understood to include portions of the closely related fields of reading, communications, publishing, and printing, as well as information science, all types of library work and all types of libraries. Library science

appears to be both a study and practice, concentrating on libraries, in all of their possible aspects, both artistic and scientific, from user analysis to service.

Perhaps comparative library science can be isolated further by describing what it is, what it is not, not quite, or not at all. The following dozen or more definitions are common and useful, but many of them are incomplete or somewhat misleading, also. Some of them have been adapted for present purposes from other comparative study areas. At any rate, their statement may help us to widen and deepen our understanding of the comparative library field, before listing a final comprehensive definition. Comparative library science has been defined as a comparison of the various kinds of libraries and the means of providing them in different countries.[17] Also, comparative library science can be called that branch of library science dealing with the policies and practices of other countries.[18] However, the first of these definitions neglected to mention the necessity of studying a specific topic and the second one neglected to mention the idea of comparison.

Another definition: comparative library science seeks to understand the similarities and differences among the libraries of all countries.[18] Obviously, this definition omitted a statement concerning systematic study, though it did include the idea of comparison. Following Noah's lead, comparative library science may be defined as the intersection of the social sciences, library science, research and the bi-national dimensions.[14] While true and stylistically intriguing, like some of the other definitions given here, this one was more nearly a comment or description than a definition.

Many other definitions of the term exist. Each author has his own. Chase Dane referred to it in several ways. In one sentence, he called it the study of library development in many countries to discover what developments have been successful and can be copied

elsewhere.[6] Also, he defined it as the examination of the philosophies and policies of librarianship on an international scale to determine long range trends, international shortcomings, contraditions and inconsistencies.[6] In still another definition, he called it the study of the causes and effects of library development throughout the world.[6] All three definitions omitted the comparative aspect, though one added the concept of cultural borrowing.

One of the favorite purposes listed for American comparative library science courses, perhpas following Dane's lead, and another way of stating a definition, was that of acquiring a deeper understanding of American librarianship thru comparisons with other countries.[19, 20] Study of library problems abroad was expected to help the student understand the same problems locally, both because of the differences and because of the similarities encountered, and to make local library improvements accordingly. However, for profitable use, the student needed to be able to evaluate thoroughly the success of the libraries studied. Since evaluation of this success often depended on inadequate evidence, however, such idea transfers were difficult to carry out.

William Jackson defined comparative library science as the study of library systems and problems in countries outside the United States and of American interaction with them.[19] To him, international library cooperation was subsumed under comparative library science, also. Obviously, this was an American-oriented definition and therefore violated the one world philosophy permeating this field. It seemed either to rule out or relegate to a low status any American interest in the comparison of Arabic with Turkish librarianship, for instance.

Asheim: promote the useful exchange of information and ideas.[21] Very inclusive, too general. White: a subject which deals with material on theory and practice found in different geographical and political areas, but one which is a methodology as well as a subject field.[15] And also, comparative library science relates to the method of treating the

data as well as to the country of the writer.[15] This definition provided another comment and sounded somewhat like international library science. It did add the concept of methodology to our thinking but seemed to omit the necessity of comparison.

Foskett suggested that the comparative method meant the collection of data on existing library stystems and their measurement against some hypothetical or actual situation used as a point of reference.[3] He pointed out the importance of comparative library science as a way of systematizing observations and the arrival of decisions based on direct observation and confirmable hypotheses rather than mere opinions or the use of secondary sources. He emphasized the importance of data collection as a foundation for comparative study. Also, Foskett suggested the importance of this method in bringing order into thinking about librarianship generally.

Shores' definition: study and comparison of library theory and practice in all of the different countries of the world for the purpose of broadening and deepening our understanding of professional problems and solutions.[22] This definition sounded reasonable, but certain of Shores' interpretations included something like, "Comparative librarianship suggests a new and critical role for librarianship. Patently, political and industrial leaders of nations have been unsuccessful in promoting world understanding. It is just possible that the quiet force of libraries can succeed where governments have failed."[22] While it is not clear just what this meant, there seem to be some implications of moralism, social welfare and peace-making here, of making the world a better place, which are unnecessary and inappropriate, idealistic and impractical. Scholarship is justifiable for its own sake without social welfare implications. Such approaches and emphasizes will only retard development and hold the field at a popular and descriptive level.

One source, speaking about sociology but presumably providing

a definition adaptable to library science, also, apparently would call comparative library science that field which is concerned with the systematic and explicit comparison of library phenomena in two or more societies.[23]

Miles Jackson: that field of study that deals with the comparison of the theory and practice of librarianship in different countries to deepen and broaden understanding of problems beyond national boundries.[5] A useful definition, very much like that of Shores.

In explication and in conclusion, however, we may ask, what different countries are included in this definition? Any other country than your own, than the author's native country, that is. If William Chait of Dayton, Ohio, U. S. A., reads a paper drawing comparisons between American and Iranian public librarianship at the American Library Association conference in Dallas, that is comparative library science. If Poori Soltani of Tehran, Iran, reads a paper at the Iranian Library Association conference in Tehran on her trip to visit American libraries, and in so doing, compares her own organization, the Tehran Book Processing Centre, with the Bro-Dart Alanar Book Processing Centre in Pennsylvania, that is comparative library science. However, if Bill reads a paper on American public libraries at the Dallas ALA conference or if Poori reads a paper on Iranian cataloging at Tehran, that is not comparative library science. If Chait's paper about Iran discusses the American library ideas now being practiced here, is it still comparative library science? Yes, and it is still comparative library science if Chait reads his Iranian paper at the Japanese Library Association conference.

Now, is it still comparative library science if Chait's paper merely lists statistics from the public libraries of several large Iranian and American cities? No, a mere listing of data from two countries is not comparative, so may be called international library science. And if

he discusses American public libraries only? No, that is neither international nor comparative library science. Comparative library science involves a cross geographical analysis and usually a cross societal analysis, also.

Theoretically, the term, comparative, when applied to library science, can refer to comparisons of any kind of library science, such as a study of Danish public and school libraries. Or, the comparison of one British charging system with another. Consequently, the most general definition of comparative library science is the study of library science by the comparative method, to study policies and practices by comparison and contrast, any policies and practices. However, this definition is not the most common one for the phrase, not the one being studied here. The special meaning of comparative library science as applying to libraries abroad has developed through common usuage, as it has in the social sciences generally. Now, the non-geographic use is quite common. It is the latter with which we are concerned here, exclusively.

For this paper, comparative library science can be called the objective and accurate statistical and factual comparison and contrast, with full background social, cultural and library data, of one library science topic in two or more countries. It is both a methodology in which a hypothesis is proven or disproven and a field of study and knowledge as well.

Related International Library Study Fields.--Simsova suggested that any aspect of library science involving more that one country which was studied as an academic discipline using methods of systematic enquiry could be called comparative library science.[2] If the study was not carried out as an academic discipline and systematic enquiry methods were not used, however, than she suggested that a second term be used for it, international library science. A study tour of libraries

aimed at promoting international understanding would be international library science, whereas a study tour planned to compare charging systems, systematically, in a number of countries, would be called comparative library science in her framework, for example. This type of interpretation is common in the field of education, also.

I do not agree with Simsova's distinction between the scholarly and the unscholarly. Surely, it should be possible to study the libraries of another country in a scholarly manner without being comparative, for example, thru normative correlations of the social and library data of that country only. And surely, many comparative library studies are not very scholarly, for instance, my own.

To me, comparative library science is and is not identical with international library science. Certain of the more general definitions given above seem to apply better to international than to comparative library science. Contrary to common practice, I believe that international library science should be used as a generic term to cover all aspects of the international affairs of libraries, all kinds of library studies involving more than one country, anything no local or national. In contrast, comparative library science, foreign library science, and international institutional library science, all three, should be subsumed under the overall term, international library science. They should be considered subdivisions of it which exist on a lower level of generality. The remainder of this paper assumes the acceptance of this definition and discusses all other parts of the field as subdivisions of international library science.

Under international library science, the field of foreign library science, listed above, is a discrete study area of its own. It is that library science carried on outside one's own country, the description of a library matter in one or more other countries. Foreign library science--the Germans call the more general term

"Auslandskunde"--consists of the study by anyone of any library subject in another country or countries, across at least one national border. The history of a library or library activity or of library science in a given country abroad is foreign library

science, for example, unless systematic comparisons are made to another country in which case it becomes comparative library science. The phrase, international relations, as used in connection with the American Library Association round table and committee by that name, must mean much the same thing as foreign library science. It must refer to the foreign relations of American librarians, but in this case, probably both with other countries (foreign library science) and with international organizations (international institutional library science). Foreign library science is illustrated by the Kaser, White, Byrd[24] book which describes librarianship in several countries not native to the authors and which evaluates but does not compare or contrast them.

Are there other ways in which foreign contrasts with comparative library science? A descriptive foreign paper would be comparative only in the comparison which the reader himself made to the librarianship of his country. If it merely laid out the facts and let the reader make his own analysis, even a paper which described libraries in several countries would not involve comparison, but would simply be called foreign library science. The comparisons must be made overtly by the author, not left to the reader's imagination, before we have a paper on comparative library science.

At the initial or elementary level, comparative library science is exemplified by a paper which objectively describes a particular library policy or practice in two libraries in different countries and then overtly compares and contrasts the two situations. Such a paper is much more useful than the foreign library science study which fails to point out these similarities. Only when all of the useful comparisons and consequent analyses and deductions are clearly written out by the author can he be said to have made full use of his data, to have helped the reader to understand the situation as much as he should have.

Four sub-types of foreign library science studies may be described here, also. These subdivisions of foreign library science include area and case studies, systematic and topical approach studies.[25] All four types of studies share with foreign library science, the more general term, the distinction of concentrating on other countries than ones own and of involving neither comparison and contrasts nor international institutional library science. However, in certain other small respects, varying from type to type, they differ from foreign library science. Therefore, while these four minor fields are classified under foreign library science, each one of them differs somewhat from each one of the others in the group and from foreign library science itself.

Area library studies fall under the general heading of foreign library science, certainly, though presumably the same term might be used to cover a study on libraries entirely within one's own country. Therefore area and foreign library science are not synonymous, but the former can usually be considered to be a subdivision of the latter. Area library science studies are mere descriptions without more than superficial analysis, usually covering several contiguous nations or sometimes a homogeneous district within one country.

An area library study lists the library characteristics in one country or area of the world.[25] It is essentially descriptive, preferably on many variables, and may provide the raw data which can be used later in a more complex comparative study. Rarely, an area library study may be analytical, not merely descriptive, but only within the data of its own area. Immediate answers to questions may be identified without extensive attempts to place the study in its cultural and historical context, to locate causation, or to make comparisons. Comparison seeks unifying themes, trends, and causes. The facts are merely the symptoms to the comparative student, though

they are usually the end product to the area student. Since it is primarily descriptive rather than analytic, Harvey's Pakistan and Afghanistan Librarianship paper is an example of an area library study. In all area studies, the data must be organized geographically as well as by type of library problem.

There is a continuum between the pure area study and the pure comparative study. The latter always has some elements of the former, but the former, in its purest form, contains no elements of the latter. As comparisons and analyses creep into an area study, it becomes more nearly comparative. In their pure forms, an area library study stresses thoroughness in gathering facts while a comparative study stresses analysis and factual comparison.

The library case study, a second type of foreign library study, is popular in international library science as well as in instructors' course outlines.[19, 20] It describes only one country without comparison, and concentrates on one topic. The majority of library case studies are historical, descriptive and informal rather than scientific. They may be interesting, but usually their reliability is unproven, so they must be approached with caution. However, to define the case study as always being a case history would be regrettable. While its history will be useful, full description of the case will provide data of potential value in several study areas. It makes no difference whether an area or case study is done by a national or a foreigner. However, a foreign library study must be done on a country not native to the researcher.

A biography or foreign library study in only one country is a case study. A library case study is not a comparative study because it does not compare its subject to anything extra-national, except perhaps occasionally and superficially. The case study is valuable to researchers generally only when it is typical of some larger group

and when this modality is shown. Otherwise, its value is restricted to the case himself or itself. Of course, several case studies on the same topic may contain the similarities which suggest the desirability of conducting a comparative study. On the other hand, the library case study may be useful for another reason, also, because more nearly analytic literature does not yet exist in quantity. Finally, we must point out that a study of one university library in each of two countries would be a comparative case study, a comparison based on only one case in each country. Additional library pairs would be needed before any generally applicable generalizations could be obtained.

Systematic and topical approach library studies, the third and fourth types of foreign library studies, involve two or more countries. They do not necessarily imply direct and overt comparison, however, so are not identical with comparative studies. Since they may include many countries or several continents, usually they are not area studies, either. Normally, the systematic study analyses many variables in a few countries or else a few variables in many countries. However, in common practice, these terms are used without strict adherance to the definitions given here. Ranganathan's admirable Headings and Canons, for example, is a curious hybrid which defies classification.[27] It has been called comparative, systematic and topical, thereby confounding everyone.

Under the general heading of international library science, we have described two major subdivisions, comparative and foreign library science. The third and last major and discrete subdivision of international library science is international institutional library science. This field is a specialised one which deals with the work of multi-national associations, libraries, organizations and events. It refers to the library activities of such multi-national institutions

as the FAO, FID, American Friends of the Middle East, and the International Standards Organization, non-national institutions. This field carries no implications of comparison and can quite properly include the simple description by its director in a Swiss library journal of the UN Library in Geneva, for instance, a subject which would not qualify as either foreign or comparative library science. The limiting factor is the non-national, or more accurately, the multi-national nature of the sponsoring organization. Obviously, a paper could be both international institutional and comparative, on the other hand, for instance, an objective comparison on ten international social science libraries in Geneva and ten in New York with the goal of reaching preliminary conclusions about international social science libraries. Also, it is possible to describe the two World Health Organization libraries, one in Alexandria and one in Delhi, without attempting to do more than that, no comparisons or contrast, and that would be narrowly international institutional and not comparative library science.

In the present series of international definitions it should be understood that, partly by their natural meanings and partly by arbitrary definition, there is no overlap between the three major fields: comparative, foreign, and international institutional library science. While the latter may seem to fit better under foreign library science, it should be realized that the definition of foreign library science is violated by international institutional library sciences frequent inclusion of the author's own country in its considerations, when the local agency has international concerns.

Neither foreign nor international library science can be included in comparative library science, since one deliberately excludes it in all cases while the other includes it instead of being included by it. International institutional library science extends comparative library science, in most cases, but comparison of international

organization library aspects is possible, also.

Definitional Summary.--To summarize, the opening sections of this paper have tried to establish definitions for the following major and minor international library terms:

a. International library science, a comprehensive term, an umbrella phrase, covers the entire field of library international relations and its studies of non-national library science. As sub-categories, it includes the three major and four minor fields listed below. Every paper in this field fits into the general concept.

b. Foreign library science is the description of any aspect of library operation in one or more countries other than the author's or publisher's own country. It specifically omits both comparative and international institutional library science. A Harvey paper on the Iranian Documentation Centre would be an example of foreign library science. All foreign area library studies as well as foreign case library studies, systematic library studies, and topical approach library studies are mutually exclusive subdivisions of foreign library science.

c. International institutional library science refers to the librarianship of international libraries, organizations, institutions, and associations. A paper on the library-connected International Children's Film Festival held annually in Tehran would be an example.

d. Comparative library science is a separate and exacting field, and few first rate examples of it exist. It is the objective and systematic comparison and contrast of libraries in two or more countries on a specific topic in order to reach conclusions useful in understanding them. The books footnoted

below by Danton and Hassenforder are superior examples.[28, 29]

General Comparative Research Methodology.--Now that we have identified international library science and its seven subdivisions, we can will concentrate on the most glamorous and difficult of these subdivisions, comparative library science. We will attempt to clarify the various stages and problems. What is the comparative research process? How should we compare libraries in different countries? Adapting freely from Bereday, Simsova and others, the comparative research process can be seen in the following progressive stages:[1, 2, 30]

1. Speculative Stage. A vague perception of a relationship connecting a specific policy or practice followed on one aspect or experimental variable in two different libraries located in different countries.
2. Initial Descriptive Stage. The systematic and complete collection of information on one experimental variable in one library in one country, usually the home country. The description may be subjective and impressionistic, but it is much more useful if it is accurately objective and statistical. Not just what, but how much must be answered, also, and not just for one other variable but for all related social and library variables.
3. Initial Analytical Stage. For one function, problem, or policy in one library, analyse the data in terms of social science and library variables while using social science methods. The correlations between many variables may be sought. Value judgements should be deduced from these analyses. Various related factors, the philosophy of library functions and national cultural characteristics become important here, since librarianship is conditioned by the whole of society. The data

should be analysed to reveal modes, means and trends in relation to the experimental variable. This variable should be fully analysed and interpreted until its causation, correlation and role are thoroughly understood in that library.

4. Description and Analysis in the Second Library Stage. The same procedure of collecting data and analysing it must be carried out for the same experimental variable in the same type of library abroad, preferably in a library which resembles the first one closely. Co-efficients of correlation must be obtained to show the usefulness of this data in predicting results for the experimental variable in the second library. This time, however, the data collection must be carried out in conformity with findings in the first library. Variables correlating poorly with the experimental variable in the first country should be dropped from consideration and only variables with high positive correlations in the first country studied further.

5. Comparative Stage. With the data collected in the previous stages, comparatively study the libraries by juxtaposition, the ideological framework in which to compare them having been determined by the two separate analyses. Juxtaposition and comparison require a simultaneous review of several social science analysis systems--sociological, political, legal, economic, geographical, meteorological, demographic, educational, and historical--as well as library science analyses, to compare the data from the two countries. Analyse the data to identify similarities and differences between countries and attempt to determine why the differences and similarities exist. This is the stage of search for commonalities, correlations and patterns among all the library and social variables. The assumptions and hypotheses or generalizations found useful in explaining

experimental variable action in one country must be proven or disproven by comparison to the same data for the other country.

6. Correlation Extension Stage. If at least one logical positive correlation is found for the experimental variable in both countries, the initial comparison has been a success, though perhaps only a very moderate and preliminary success, and perhaps only in the short run. After one successful attempt, the same technique should be applied to several similar libraries in the same two countries for the same experimental variable and those variables found useful in explaining it. In other words, the previously proven hypothesis must be tested on new libraries in the same two countries. Only with such correlation extension to a number of libraries can any useful generalizations or principles be developed. Only by such extension can anything more than intriguing case studies be developed. Just how large the sampling should be is hard to say and will depend on the circumstances. However, a few libraries will almost never be enough, and even a few dozen libraries will seldom be very firm base for useful generalizations. Often a carefully stratified sampling or else a fourth to a half of the universe must be used before the conclusions will have general national usefulness.
7. National Extension Stage. With continued positive correlations on the same variables, the same technique may be applied to libraries in additional countries. This extension will involve a study in several countries to prove internationally the hypothesis derived from the earlier bi-national juxtapositions.
8. Predictive Stage. With continued correlative success, predictions of international relationships between variables

can be made, based on the evidence at hand. The achievement of this stage enables the researcher to claim that he has reached the immediate goal of comparative library science, knowledge and understanding of causation for one variable in several countries.

9. Methodological Stage. Through close analysis of previous steps, evolve new theories concerning the situation and new research methods. Design new and more effective methods of studying the same and similar problems with new data.

10. Further Research Stage. The same and other researchers should study other carefully selected library experimental variables closely related to the first variable in the same type of library and in several countries. By this means, they will extend their understanding and predictive ability to closely related variables. Eventually, whole units of library science may be covered, such as school library charging systems, or theological seminary cataloging policies. Of course, the comparison of entire libraries will seldom be sensible, instead, specific library policies, problems and functions must be compared.

11. Systems Analysis Stage. In the future, after much objective data is collected about certain types of libraries in two countries, whole library systems should be compared, such as nation-wide school library systems, and hypotheses proven concerning them.

12. Law Formulation Stage. The final research stage should lead to the formulation of laws explaining the activities of specific types of library work and libraries within specific groups of countries, such as, socialist or Southeast Asian countries. The ultimate goal of comparative library science is to develop useful policy principles or laws and

to understand them thoroughly. The laws must either be universally true in all countries for certain types of libraries and types of library work in certain kinds of countries or types of library situations. In other words, the law formulator must be able to prove that his law is valid world-wide or else in specific named library situations of widespread occurrance.

Summarized, the comparative library research stages are speculation, description, analysis, comparison and interpretation, correlation, extension, and prediction. Or, stated differently, observation, analysis, understanding, prediction, and finally, control. Some variation in the order of the stages is permissable. For instance, the analysis stage may be postponed until both sets of national data are complete, then by juxtaposition and analysis promising causal variables can be identified.

In the descriptive stage, the data must be identified, named, grouped, and classified. In fact, a subject classification may provide a helpful framework even before the data are collected. Often, the researcher's measurements will require scaling and ranking the data. Selecting the units and indices for comparison is often a difficult part of the task because of their doubtful comparability. Sampling techniques will be useful in many situations, also.

Analysis should proceed from the lesser to the greater generality. First, the researcher studies the local picture and shows that one experimental problem or dependent variable can be proven to result from the action of one or more other variables. He starts working in a microcosm, with a pair of libraries. For the comparative researcher to attempt to analyse several basic experimental variables in one study instead of concentrating on one only, will normally complicate it unduly and lead to superficiality. A better comparative study

attempts to explain the causation of one experimental variable and to find its positive relationship with as many other relevant social and library variables as possible. In general, the Danton study is a good example of such narrow concentration.[28] The proof of a relationship must be build up gradually for one small aspect of library science. Before generalizations can be made about major factors, they must be proven about the minor variables composing them. The importance of continuing the data collection and analysis until significant generalizations can be made should be fully realized, of course.

After success in one country, the researcher applies the successful hypothesis to another sample country in an attempt to prove the truth of the hypothesis--or the truth of the variable's covariability--in the macrocosm. If successful in the second country, then the attempt can be made to validate the hypothesis by proving it in a third country. By adding other countries to the analysis, fourth, fifth, sixth and so on, the researcher may eventually be able to approach universal applicability of his hypothesis, and it will become a proven generalization, principle, policy, or law, always subject to certain assumptions and conditions, of course.

The difference between juxtaposition and comparison should be understood. The researcher must juxtapose the data before he can compare it overtly. Textual juxtaposition arranges the data or information in layers, one after another, so they can be compared more easily. Tabular form arranges the data vertically. In comparison, which must always follow juxtaposition, the researcher must balance the data of each kind for one country against the data of the same kind for the other country. He must frequently refer back and forth between countries for comparisons as he moves from variable to variable. Many comparative library science studies are at best only juxtaposition studies.

If the data descriptive and analytical stages have narrowed down the number of variables to a few, then the comparative stage can be

carried out quite simply and quickly. However, since the researcher may start with several hundred variables, he may be required to juxtapose and compare many more variables than a few. The number will be large and the process slower if the researcher collects data on his variables and then juxtaposes, analyses and compares them, all in the same stage.

Simsova discussed the comparative method as a scientific research method.[2] The comparative method is the comparison or process of searching for likenesses in differences or for differences in likenesses as between two or more phenomena, carried out in the scientific manner. To be scientific, the comparison should be guided by a library conceptual framework derived logically from a theory which explains the phenomenon or variable being studied. Facts cannot be understood except in a superficial way unless they are fitted into the context of explanations stressing their causes and correlations. The data should be quantitative, with definitions fully developed and explained. They should cover thoroughly the variable being researched and be gathered carefully. A satisfactory system is needed for proving the truth about the hypothesis concerning the experimental variable, one which is based on objective, varifiable and conclusive research methods, one yielding reliable results and preferably explaining causation. A priori assumptions about libraries and librarians must be avoided until proven by responsible research.

Comparative library science is one of the social sciences and studies the social forces which cause library events. Prevailing library policies and practices can be fully understood only when the researcher analyses the social and cultural background in which these facts exist. Hassenforder has done this type of social analysis well, in a historical context.[29] Fitting library variables into the national cultural life is often difficult and time consuming, however. It requires thought, discussion with nationals, and research to clarify the situation. Comparative

library science should not be identified with any of the social sciences to the exclusion of the others, however, but it should be related to all of them to the extent that they bear on specific problems. In a country where we find few readers, the literacy rate should be investigated, for instance.

It is said that comparative studies are justified because, like the other social sciences, library science must study people, institutions and objects which cannot be manipulated, held constant and controlled as easily as can a test tube of water. The social sciences generally must be satisfied with less universally applicable truths and and proof, and instead can seldom prove a hypothesis for more than partial universality, with geographic and temporal limitations being important. While this is true, several other kinds of social science research studies are justified for this same reason, and there is no reason to restrict the study method to comparisons except where they are appropriate. The country can never be held constant, since comparative library science must study two or more countries, but the type of library and library work must be held constant. Any aspect of library science can be studied by this method as long as it is practiced in two or more countries. Most comparative studies start with a detailed knowledge of the researchers' own library.

What is the relation between adaptation of foreign library ideas and comparative library science? Since borrowing and adapting, consciously or unconsciously done, are so very common, any study of two country's libraries is sure to come across many cases of borrowing and adapting. In fact, this may be a significant part of the analysis and comparison. Identifying the origin of an idea may be satisfying but borrowing it is more useful.

Comparative Library Science Research Techniques.--Instead of a unique comparative research method, several methods exist.[31] They include

statistical comparisons, problem analyses, trend identification, factorial and analytical approaches, analysis against norms, developmental criteria identification, and historical analyses. The researcher must validate both qualitatively by argument and quantitatively by statistical methods. Studies of circulation and budgets are examples which will often be primarily statistical. Much good comparative library research turns out to be correlative study attempting to show the statistical relationship between two or more variables.

The problem approach is a natural one for comparative studies and should yield much interesting and useful future work. A survey and analysis of solutions to a particular problem in similar nations, e. g., book loss or publicity displays, if pinned down enough by narrow focus, can have pratical value. Trend analysis is important to the extent that it identifies foreign influences or at least foreign echos of the trends being described, but isolating trend causation should be of first importance. Such trends as those toward open stacks and rural library service come easily to mind as available for study.

Comparative Education Review and Comparative Education have published studies on comparative teaching methods, and other subjects in which mathematical and situational research techniques were used.[32, 33] Another example was an objective seventy five country study of mathematics education test achievement.[34] Mathematical models for explanation, prediction and planning can be useful, also. Theoretical model construction of teaching techniques can lead to the restructuring of teacher education programs. Mental and personality differences reflecting national cultural characteristics may be important. Factor analysis can be used to classify data between dependent and independent variables, leading the researcher closer to causation.

The establishment of norms or standards may be useful for comparative purposes. Analysis of two stituations against a norm

may be helpful in placing them properly in relation to a wider sampling of countries. Perhaps the Iranian library standards produced by this author can be used for this purpose, for example.

Foskett pointed out the desirability of doing comparisons to superior examples, ideals, or models, also.[3] Comparative studies need not necessarily consider this approach, however. The field contains no implication that the comparison need be made to a model or ideal or even to a superior or successful example. The systematic comparison of a library variable in different countries is justified for its own sake without the necessity of trying to improve anyone's library.

Identifying static versus dynamic situations and the factors influencing library development are worthwhile. Traditionally, the comparative method has been used in education as a way of predicting the outcome of a particular educational idea or trend or problem solution without having to carry out this idea in the researcher's own country. It has provided a way of conducting an experiment without having to do it oneself, but merely by watching other people carry it out. Predicting national development based on experience in a somewhat more advanced country having a similar cultural milieu should be useful exercise, under the proper conditions. For instance, Kuwaiti public librarians might study Egyptian public library development. The entire area of library reform and planning for future development is one in which comparisons should be useful. When trying to predict results in one situation by studying the results in another one, however, it takes a great deal of reliable data about a situation to be able to extrapolate or adjust for measurements which do not agree. This approach tends to become increasingly risky and unreliable as the relevant variables are found to be dissimilar to those in one's own situation.

While historical methods will always have a place in comparative

research, a comparative study should not be required to concern itself with the past. Current is more valuable than older information. The social science method rejects the historical method for most studies. While sometimes useful in suggesting areas deserving more detailed analysis and in spotting relationships, the historical method seldom provides the final word in proving a relationship. The past is only a partial guide and often demographic, economic, educational, political and sociological approaches will be more useful in studying the present and forecasting the future. In such analyses as the effect of the contrasting social philosophies on the extensiveness of public library dispersion in the socialist vs. the Arab countries, for instance, the historical method would be only partially helpful. Comparative library studies do over space what historical studies do over time. Of course, it is possible to combine history and geography by studying the libraries of two countries at a past period or even to compare two country's libraries at two different historical periods.

Each study comparison should utilize a fully developed questionaire or testing instrument for data collection. Preferably, however, this instrument, or at least a major part of it, should, if possible, be one which can be used again by later students, rather than having them devise data collection and analysis instruments which are not comparable. In this way, the data collected may have a cumulative impact rather than providing only separate studies.

To the extent possible, international and comparative students should undertake library science research topics which will enable them to understand an important aspect of library science, not an insignificant aspect of it. Obviously, the more significant the matter studied, the more useful conclusions on it may be. For example, the generalization that most UAR library catalog cards are tan in color, while most Israeli catalog cards are white, does not add usefully to

our understanding of West Asian librarianship, except perhaps to suggest that Israeli librarianship may be somewhat better supported financially than that of the UAR. On the other hand, to prove that UAR public libraries have small and partially cooled reading rooms because their service philosophy is poorly developed while Israeli public libraries have large, cool reading rooms because their service philosophy is well developed, may be of greater usefulness in future research.

Also, the presence of the American, Harvey, to aid the Iranian Documentation Centre, instead of the Unesco advisor which the Pakistan National Scientific Documentation Center had, may have left its mark on each organization and may be worthy of comparative and contrastive analysis. A revealing study might be made of the influence of national characteristics and social problems on the development and structure of the four West and South Asian Unesco-aided national documentation centers, Insdoc, Pansdoc, Nidoc and Turdok, as well. The data collection problem and establishment of the social problems and national characteristics of these four countries would be a formidable project, however. In all cases, it should be realized that the criteria for evaluating a piece of comparative library research as good or poor, useful or useless, have not been established nor even considered, aside from those customary in social science research evaluation generally.

In most library science fields, carrying out scholarly comparisons in depth requires a long and rigorous preparation. Travel and residence abroad leading to personal knowledge of a library system are invaluable, since statistical evidence alone is never adequate for thorough understanding. Of course, it is necessary to maintain a friendly and helpful attitude toward both countries being studied since their data are being used to achieve greater understanding of the library world. Foreign language competence of a high order for both countries, travel,

acquaintance and correspondants in each country, knowledge of the cultural history, trends, and patterns influential in the countries, several years residence in both, and curbing of the author's own cultural and personal biases are required.

Comparative Library Science Research Problems.--Comparative library science has not advanced beyond the introductory stage. Its development began in the humanistic tradition which it shared with other library fields. However, following publication of the Simsova and Danton volumes, with their espousal and use of the ideas current among comparative education and library science leaders, the old humanistic and descriptive approach can no longer be defended. Its lack of precision and careful definition of terms and the absence of a framework of theory into which hypotheses and findings can be fitted have made it obsolete.

Most of the present literature of comparative library science is descriptive, anecdotal or horatory, superficial or suggestive, and of only fleeting usefulness. Factual and narrative papers greatly outnumber analytical papers. Instead of being a field which has produced generalizations with predictive value, it is still merely pleasant and exotic, perhaps now becoming fashionable and attracting a number of intellectual tourists. Some of the authors who have written explicative papers on the subject have done little or no research in the field itself.

The Asheim[21] and White[15] contributions, well known in the field, were essentially sets of conclusions.[15,21] Each author analysed an extensive set of data before drawing conclusions but gave little of this data to the reader. The entire conclusion-forming process was omitted from the text of each book. Therefore, their contributions, excellent in several other ways, are relatively unsatisfactory in this way. The reader is deprived of the opportunity to study and evaluate the data and methodology and to reach his own conclusions.

The Munthe study, American Librarianship from a European Angle, so often quoted in the literature as a fine comparative study sample, in some ways is a poor one.[35] While fascinating to the American reader for its penetrating observations, and an early example of the systematic attempt to relate practice in two geographic areas, it remains a very unscientific performance. As a comparison, it is poor, since the Norwegian or European side, presumably the other nationality used for comparison with the American, is poorly spelled out and compared, thru juxtaposition or any other method. Further, the whole thing is not "proven" in any social scientific sense. The attempt to compare broad areas of librarianship, as he did, is fruitless anyhow, except in little more than a vaguely descriptive manner, based on personal observation and analysis.

Munthe's book is the kind of study which should be referred to as an interesting early and primitive example of the comparative library science method. Unfortunately, this manner of studying situations abroad is still the mode in 1972, and Munthe's shrewdness is seldom present. Library travel abroad can be exciting, but its description rarely provides the objective analysis needed to establish generalizations useful in comparing the countries seen. Normally, comparative studies concentrate on a very narrow topic forming only a small part of such a trip, and the time is not available in which to collect the data needed for proper analysis of use and efficiency.

Another comparative library research problem results from the popularity among international library science papers of emphasizing differences rather than likenesses. For example, few Iranians return from Moscow emphasizing the two countrys' similarities in personnel problems, the difficulty of getting Russian and Iranian librarians to work hard and cooperatively toward common goals. Certainly, similarities and differences are important, and we must identify and collect data on

both of them. Further, it is true that the contrasts may be quaint and interesting, but are they significant for other libraries? In all situations, it is more important to seek performance modes which will allow prediction by their similarities rather than to seek differences which will not allow prediction. The purpose of comparative analysis is to locate variables which possess positive correlations with each other. Negative findings may be interesting but are usually less helpful. The term, comparative library science, suggests the importance of similarities, whereas such a term as contrastive library science would suggest a field seeking only to discover differences.

Foskett emphasizes the importance of ascertaining causation.[3] The need to first understand the society in which the library exists must be realized if we are to root out social and library causation. Attempting to ascertain causes on an international basis is difficult, however. It is doubtful if we can define and measure our own and his policies and practices until we are sure that we understand fully the social and psychological factors causing a foreign librarian to carry out his ideas in a different manner from ours. Only when we have achieved this understanding can we consider how his ideas should influence ours, if at all.

The comparability of the library situation in two countries may be said to vary with the similarities of the cultures being described, particularly with the similarities of their degrees of sophistication. Some critics have suggested the fruitlessness of even considering the comparison of situations which generally lack a strong degree of cultural similarity. It may be questioned whether or not Lebanese engineering librarians would be compared usefully with Russian engineering librarians, for instance, because the societies and political systems in which they operate are so different. Whether this generalization is always true or not is doubtful, but certainly

the number of similarities would be much reduced in very dissimilar situations, and the number of variables on which it would be possible to make useful comparisons would be small. Such a situation would suggest one in which two contrasting case studies were compared by a third person uselessly. There are circumstances where such an exploratory study can be interesting, however, even if not very useful, if only to identify and confirm the few similarities available.

What about the comparability of the libraries themselves? Is it possible to compare the libraries of two countries fairly and accurately? Is it fair to compare a Bulgarian public library with a Swiss public library? Can a communist library have the same goals as a capitalist library? Can a library staff trained in the Prussian manner of scholarly historical and theoretical study plus internship operate a library with the same goals as one operated by a Canadian educated librarian? Can a Liverpool special library 100 years old be thought to be in any way comparable to a Nairobi special library two years old? Or is the field of comparative library science a sham and a fake? Certainly every country is culturally different and its libraries reflect some of these differences. Probably, because of national political and social differences, certain library systems are much more difficult to compare than others, however.

Of course, comparability depends on what the libraries are trying to accomplish. If Bulgarian library goals are similar to those of American libraries, then they can be evaluated fairly against an American set of library standards. Or, if their goals are similar to those of Iranian libraries, then an Iranian set of standards may be used. If their goals are somewhat different but still largely the same, then, with a few adaptations, perhaps they can be compared fairly. If the library goals are vastly different, then an entirely new set of standards is necessary and the libraries cannot be compared usefully except on

the most general level or else for isolated problems. White has some interesting remarks on this topic.[56]

This discussion leads to the question of the appropriateness of evaluations in comparative studies. Some students may reject them, but to me, they seem often to be necessary in calculating the success of a particular library policy. Its usefulness should be considered before considering its comparability. Evaluations are necessary at several points in the analyses and cannot be avoided. On the other hand, this statement does not necessarily imply that well researched and developed evaluation instruments or standards are now available. Certainly, in the U. S. A., at least, they are not. Nor can they be provided until the purposes and functions of specific types of libraries are agreed to. The present statement, in a practical way, merely points out the usefulness, on occasion, of existing standards, preliminary though they may be, for library evaluation and comparison.

In a socialist country with a strong central government, like Bulgaria, certain differences of organization and administration can be expected when comparison is made with Switzerland, having a different political and economic system. However, this paper assumes most of these to be differences in practice, not in policies, principles or goals. Perhaps, even USSR libraries can be examined by an American with standards modified only partially.

The degree to which libraries in Bulgaria and Switzerland are comparable would decrease primarily as their goals differed. Of course, school library service philosophy, in socialist countries, for instance, is tied closely to the political, economic and social systems and attempts to reinforce them with many books explaining the socialist philosophy. However, political books in capitalist country school libraries are likely to explain the local political system, also. Within what points on this continuum of comparability or

incomparability the comparative library scientist must operate to produce useful results is hard to say and may vary from situation to situation, also. He will almost never find two situations which are exactly comparable will often need to operate in situations which are far from providing perfect comparability. Whether or not he can obtain useful results at the other extreme of the scale, however, seems doubtful.

As an example of the similarity of seemingly different libraries, the basic goals of school libraries generally are to select material which will be useful to the school students and faculty, particularly in their course work, acquire it efficiently, organize it so the right user can locate it easily, provide capable and helpful user assistance, circulate the material simply, and in large numbers, and carry out administration in such a way that the library staff's work is strongly supported. The successful school library is used heavily per student and makes a strong impact on the school, and the unsuccessful school library is not and does not, and these facts do not change from country to country. On this level of generality, the goals of most of the world's school libraries would be quite comparable, no matter the political system under which they worked.

Consequently, a good Iranian school library would look and function much like a good UK school library. The adjustment for Iran's backwardness should not be made in changing the library's goals, but only in the immediate, the contemporary standards. The Iranian library's ultimate goals and its users' ultimate needs are much the same as those of the UK, though now, the immediate goals are much simpler in Iran. Good librarianship is the same in both places, though it is temporarily unrealistic to expect an Iranian school to have a good library. Eventually, yes, but now, no. In many cases, the description of the educationally and financially successful library differs little

from country to country, what differs is the country's ability in terms of social, library and educational variables to produce it at a particular point in time.

More detailed statements of purposes, goals and policies would begin to separate out several different types of school libraries. At lower points on descending levels of detail, when we checked minor policies and procedures, the libraries would separate even more.

To the extent that it is true to say that no two situations are alike, especially when comparing countries, then it is difficult to learn very much, to pick up practical ideas, except in general terms, about one's own situation by looking at someone else's. Attractive as this use of the comparative method may seem to be, it is going out of fashion, at least temporarily, and comparative scholars are claiming only to learn something about educational or social processes. Many seek to understand, not to reform, to analyse and classify for the immediate future, rather than to predict for the distant future. It is of basic importance to understand the immediate situation first, before any further use is made of the data, and that is difficult enough to accomplish without adding the hazards of prediction. While certainly of ultimate value, particularly for planning future development, prediction is a step for which few comparative library researchers are ready.

Another research problem relates to the lack of a theoretical basis for research. The study of libraries in various countries is made difficult by the lack of well defined theories from which to deduce hypotheses. We can expect such theories to be developed within leading library nations, then be applied to bi-national situations. Without strong theoretical development in the well developed nations, however, the comparative library scientist's work is made harder. In fact, the lack of well established library theories in any country, especially in developing countries, may in part account for the scarcity of

comparative library studies.

In addition, the study of libraries in various countries is made difficult by the lack of accurate and comparable data. Usually, the data are not being recorded in a developing country, and even if they are, their definitions are not fully equivalent to the definitions used in the researcher's own country. So little statistical data is available on Iran librarianship that objective studies are almost impossible, unless the researcher collects his own data, a difficult thing to do.

Even though most of their papers represent a low level of scholarship, much of what is known in foreign library science is based on the observations of visitors, at least much of what we can read in western languages. Such travellers as Kaser, Stone, Byrd, and Bonn describe objective pictures which are useful in evaluating the progress and needs of Asian countries.[24, 37] Though they may not qualify as scholarly, certainly many examples of foreign library science are useful to comparative researchers and lead them to many of their research topics.

Comparative library science is such a new and difficult field as to leave the impression that its scholarly study is impossible to carry out successfully. However, that is not true. While comparative library studies between countries must usually be expressed in somewhat more general terms than those conducted within one country, thereby reducing their usefulness to some extent, this situation does not reduce their usefulness to zero. There is surely to be forecast an eventual stage of development at which the comparison of libraries superficially, almost the only comparisons available now, will give way to comparison with accurate data available in many countries and to abstract reasoning and analysis of the common factors among them.

A Larger Frame of Reference.--The global or one world concept of library

science has been mentioned many times, recently by the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science.[38] This concept and its assumptions are part of the theory of international library science, that librarianship is a worldwide phenomenon, that the activities of other countries are often interesting, and that they can make useful study topics. Most libraries around the world are believed to have similar purposes and to carry out their tasks in similar ways to preserve man's heritage, organize, display and encourage its use. A global perspective tends to enhance appreciation of contributions abroad. This section will attempt to explain the global viewpoint in some detail.

The basic assumption in this theory suggests that western countries do not possess all of the world's well developed libraries. Hence, the one world approach implies consideration of all countries, their contributions and conditions of librarianship, and implies the existance of a global commonality of library activities and of a world-wide community of library interest. A country's small size or underdeveloped culture should provide no reason for discrimination or prejudice of any kind toward it. Furthermore, many library trends are apparently world-wide and can be found to have similar causes. Each nation's libraries are significant not only for its own cultural development but for other nations' cultural development, also. The global concept of library science should help to bring out the varying patterns of library service and encourage greater understanding of them.

The increasing interest in international library science must be due in part to the increasing number of librarians and information scientists who are having some direct contact with foreign material and libraries. Improved international communication and transportation influence the foreign implications and reflections of educational activities. Many research libraries spend significant portions of their material budgets in dozens of other countries. Future automated

information networks will be international, e. g., the work of Medlars, Chemical Abstracts and Science Citation Index, and an increasing number of librarians will work in other countries. The global view is the same to the Iranian as to the Chilean, also.

The writing of Nasser Sharify is helpful in explaining the role of international studies in providing a new frontier for all librarians.[39] However, he points out their greater importance for developing than for developed countries. The latter have their own library literature and have already reached a certain level of success. Their occupational attention is held almost completely by the many projects which they have under way, and arousing interest in foreign projects is difficult. Often, however, the developing countries have just started modern libraries and are determined to move up quickly without having their own literature. They are forced into bi-lingual reading, conference attendance, and the intensive study of international library progress, there being nothing locally worth study or emulation.

There are several fundamental problems to be overcome, however, before global consideration can claim their proper share of library attention. The international free flow of information is still hindered by the difficulty of contacting unknown librarians and by national barriers of culture, language, education, censorship, and mail service. International associations do not yet attract librarians from all countries to their conferences, nor papers to their journals. Almost without exception, they seem weaker than the major national library associations and their publications less well known. Often, even British, Australian and American librarians seem not to be cognisant of each others' activities, so it is not surprising that the higher language barriers keep other nations apart. Check the bibliographic citations in a British or American library or information science book by percentage, UK vs. American,

and the result will often by 90% local, in each country.

The importance of the global viewpoint to library education can hardly be overestimated. Library school study of all kinds of international library science should receive increased emphasis. Faculty members should become fully aware of the world-wide dimensions of their specialities, and the entire curriculum should be reoriented and impregnated with the international approach. Such a shift in attention should help to make curricula more nearly universal in usefulness. The school which persists in ignoring the wider frame of reference will fail to prepare its students properly for their future library roles. Also, it is possible to learn more about western library science by studying eastern library science. This idea is spelled out by Sharify as well as by Sable and Deya.[40]

Surely, it is an act of arrogance and national provinciality to limit study to the library science of one's own country when the student could be studying the larger and more significant world scene. It is as if larger and more signigicant matters were deliberately screened off in order to consider local matters only. Such an approach is almost as provincial as studying Pennsylvania librarianship and claiming that one is thereby well prepared for a library career in the late 20th century. The likelihood that one's lifetime contacts and work locations will remain within one state or nation are quite small. In developing the field of international library science, supplementing library nationalism is a primary purpose. Eventually, library educations hsould become truly international with each country teaching the best elements of library science world-wide. Only then, will comparative library science be recognized as the library field of ultimate importance.

Unfortunately, even for those instructors wishing to use it, there is little global library science information available now. No

science of public librarianship exists, for instance, although there may be the beginning of a science of British public librarianship or of Swedish public librarianship, to list two examples. In other words, no globally applicable public library science has been developed, no body of generalized or internationalized principles independent of their national setting, merely various national public library sciences. In many cases, the various national principles are similar and are probably derived from the principles of other countries, e. g., those of Australia from the UK, but no one has attempted to trace their origins or to reduce them to a set of basic, internationally used principles. This project should be of concern to all persons interested in international library science. In the same way, the entire field of international library science should be of concern to all modern librarians.

## Bibliography

1. Bereday, George, Comparative Method in Education, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

2. Simsova, S. and McKee, M., A Handbook of Comparative Librarianship, London, Clive Bingley, 1970.

3. Foskett, D. J. "Comparative Librarianship," in Progress in Library Science, edited by R. L. Collison, London, Butterworth, 1965, Chapter IX.

4. Shores, Louis, "Why Comparative Librarianship?" Wilson Library Bulletin XLI (October, 1966), pp. 200-6.

5. Jackson, Miles, "Editorial," Journal of Library History I (January, 1966), p. 133.

6. Dane, Chase, "The Benefits of Comparative Librarianship," Australian Library Journal III (July, 1954), pp. 89-91.

7. See also, Bereday, G. Z. F., "Reflections on Comparative Methodology in Education, 1964-66," Comparative Education III (June, 1967), pp. 169-87.

8. Personal letters from J. Periam Danton, University of California, Berkeley, February 16, 1970, October 21, 1971, and November 29, 1971.

9. Personal letter from Margaret Rufsvold, Indiana University, Graduate Library School, Bloomington, May 6, 1970.

10. Personal letter from Dorthy Collings, United Nations, New York, May 5, 1970.

11. Personal letter from Robert Vosper, University of California, Los Angeles, April 21, 1970.

12. Personal letter from D. J. Foskett, University of London, London, October 5, 1971.

13. Personal letter from S. Simsova, North-Western Polytechnic, School of Librarianship, Islington, January 12, 1972.

14. Noah, Harold, "Editorial," Comparative Education Review XIII (October, 1969), pp. 249-51.

15. White, Carl, Bases of Modern Librarianship, London, Pergamon Press, 1964.

16. Sharify, Nasser, Piggford, R. R., "First Institute on International Comparative Librarianship," Pennsylvania Library Association Bulletin XXI (November, 1965), pp. 73-80.

17. Harrod, L. M., Glossary of Library Terms, London, Deutsch, 1969.

18. Adapted from Bereday, George, Comparative Method in Education.

19. University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Comparative and International Librarianship Course Outline.

20. University of California, School of Librarianship, Berkeley, L. 292 Comparative Librarianship Course Outline.

21. Asheim, Lester, Librarianship in the Developing Countries, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1966.

22. Shores, Louis,"Comparative Librarianship; A Theoretical Approach," in Jackson, Miles, Comparative and International Librarianship, Westport, Connecticutt, Greenwood Publishing Corporation, 1970, Chapter I.

23. Adapted from Marsh, R. M., Comparative Sociology 1950-63: a Trend Report and a Bibliography, London, Moulton and Co., 1966.

24. Kaser, David, Stone, Walter, and Byrd, Cecil, Library Development in Eight Asian Countries, Metuchen, New Jersey, Scarecrow Press, 1968.

25. Spolton, Lewis, "Methodology in Comparative Education," Comparative Education IV (March, 1969), pp. 109-115.

26. Harvey, John F., "Pakistan and Afghan Librarianship," Pakistan Library Bulletin II (September-December, 1969), pp. 9-17.

27. Ranganathan, S. R., Headings and Canons: Comparative Study of Five Catalogue Codes, Madras, V. Viswanathan, 1955.

28. Danton, J. Periam, Book Selection and Collections: A Comparison of German and American University Libraries, New York, Columbia University Press, 1963.

29. Hassenforder, Jean, Developpement Comparé des Bibliotheques Publiques en France, en Grande-Bretagne et aus Etats-unis Dans la Seconde Moitie du XIX Siecle (1850-1914), Paris, Circle de la Librairie, 1967.

30. Cirigliano, G. F. J., "Stages of Analysis in Comparative Education," Comparative Education Review X (February, 1966), pp. 18-20.

31. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York, Macmillan Company, 1968, Volume 14.

32. Halls, H. D., "Comparative Education--Explorations," Comparative Education III (June, 1967), pp. 189-93.

33. Siffin, W. J., "The Social Sciences, Comparative Education, the Future and All That," Comparative Education Review XIII (October, 1969), pp. 252-9.

34. Asher, William and Shively, J. E., "The Technique of Discriminate Analysis: A Reclassification of Harbison and Myers 75 Countries," Comparative Education Review (June, 1969), pp. 180-6.

35. Munthe, Wilhelm, American Librarianship From a European Angle, Hamden, Conn., Shoe String Press, 1939.

36. White, Carl, "Acceleration of Library Development in Developing Countries," pp. 241-85, in Voight, Melvin, Advances in Librarianship, New York, Academic Press, 1970, Volume I.

37. Bonn, George, Library Education and Training in Developing Countries, Honolulu, East West Press, 1966.

38. Kent, Allen and Lancour, Harold, editors, Encylopedia of Library and Information Science, New York, Dekker, 1969-

39. Sharify, Nasser, "The Need for Change in Present Library Science Curricula," pp. 171-96, in Bone, L., Library Education: An International Survey, Urbana, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1968.

40. Sable, Martin and Deya, Lourdas, "Outline of an Introductory Course in International and Comparative Librarianship," International Library Review II (April, 1970), pp. 187-92.

9-1-72